REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are pending in this patent application and they have all been rejected. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended and no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Support for the amended claims can be found generally throughout the specification and specifically on page 2, lines 8-12, and page 12, lines 2-12.

Present Invention

A computer system, in accordance with the present invention, comprises a processor for executing an arithmetic operation and a display unit for displaying a result of the arithmetic operation executed by the processor. The processor executes a process for detecting a display brightness in a certain window displayed on a screen of the display unit. Furthermore, the processor executes a process for controlling the display unit so as to change a screen brightness of the display unit according to the detected display brightness in the window. As a result, the display brightness is changed to improve the display a visibility of the display unit to an user viewing the display unit.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "suer's" should be changed to "user's" (see Page 2, Line 13 of the Instant Specification). Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant has corrected the typographical error on page 2, line 13 and has also corrected another typographical error discovered in the specification on page 2, line 5. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the objection has been overcome.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the processor executes the following processings for:" renders it unclear whether the subsequent claimed subject matter represents actual "processings" executed by the processor, or rather reasons for a plurality of "processings" to be executed by the processor. Perhaps the applicant meant to say, "the processor executes the following processings:"? Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant has amended claim 1 such that the phrase "the processor executes the following processings for:" has been replaced with "the processor executes the following processings:." Applicant has also made a similar amendment to claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objections have been overcome.

Rejections — 35 USC §112

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the display brightness" in line 5 and the limitation "the screen" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for either limitation in the claim.
9. Claim 1 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between the "display brightness" recited in line 5, "a screen brightness" recited in line 7, and "the brightness" recited in line 9. It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether "the brightness" refers to "the display brightness" or "screen brightness."
10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.
11. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "an image" recited in line 2, "an image" recited in line 7, and "the image" recited" in line 8. It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the claim is referring to a single identical image, or rather referring to two separate and distinct images.
12. Claim 3 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are between "a brightness control signal" recited in line 6 and "a brightness control signal" recited in line 10-11. It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether the claim is referring to a single identical brightness control signal, or rather referring to two separate and distinct brightness control signals.

Applicant has amended claim 1 such that the phrase "display brightness" and the term "screen" have sufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has also

amended claim 1 to make clear that the brightness referred to on line 9 refers to the "display" brightness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is clear and definite and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been overcome.

In regards to the rejection of claim 3, Applicant has amended claim 3 to include a first image and a second image. Applicant has also amended claim 3 such that there is a single "brightness control signal" recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 3 is clear and definite and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 has been overcome.

Rejections — 35 USC §102(e)

14. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Evanicky et al (US 6,611,249 B1)*.

Regarding claim 1, Evanicky discloses a computer system [Fig. 1; 10], comprising: a processor [Fig. 1; 12] for executing an arithmetic operation (see Column 6, Line 15 - Column 7, Line 12); and a display unit [Fig. 2; 216] for displaying a result [Fig. 17; 1100] of the arithmetic operation executed by the processor (see Column 7, Lines 15-56); wherein the processor executes the following processings for: detecting [Fig. 14D; 800] the display brightness in a certain window [Fig. 17; 1140] displayed on the screen [Figs. 2 & 17; 210] of the display unit; and controlling the display unit so as to change a screen brightness of the display unit according to the detected display brightness in the window (see Column 19, Line 48 - Column 20, Line 24), and the display unit changing the brightness [Fig. 16; 1060] under the control of the processor (see Column 18, Line 30 - Column 19, Line 47).

Regarding claim 2, Evanicky discloses the processor is controlled by an operating system (see Column 19, Lines 58-67) having a power management function and wherein the processor controls (see Column 12, Lines 38-55) the display unit with use of the power management function of the operating system so as to change the screen brightness of the display unit (see Column 15, Lines 42-58).

Regarding claim 3, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 1; furthermore, Evanicky discloses a liquid crystal display unit [Fig. 2; 216], comprising: a liquid crystal display screen [Figs. 2, 3, and 17; 210] for displaying an image (see Column 7, Line 57 - Column 10, Line 14); a back-light [Fig. 3; 132, 136] for lighting the liquid crystal display screen; and a brightness controller [Fig. 1; 12] for controlling a brightness of the back-light (see Column 7, Lines 15-56); wherein the brightness controller executes processings for: receiving a brightness control signal [Fig. 14D; 800] generated according to a display brightness in a specific area [Fig. 17; 1140]calculated from a draw signal in an image in the specific area (see Column 19, Line 48 - Column 20, Line 24), the image being selected from a plurality of images to be displayed in the liquid crystal display screen; and changing the brightness [Fig. 16; 1060] of the back-light according to a brightness control signal (see Column 18, Line 30 - Column 19, Line 47).

Claim 1

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1. For ease of review, claim 1 is reproduced below:

1. A computer system, comprising:
a processor for executing an arithmetic operation; and
a display unit for displaying a result of the arithmetic operation executed by the processor; wherein the processor executes the following processings:
detecting a display brightness in a certain window displayed on a screen of the display unit; and
controlling the display unit so as to change a screen brightness of the display unit according to the detected display brightness in the window to change the display brightness to improve a visibility of the display unit to an user viewing the display unit.

Evanicky discloses a graphic user interface which provides a color profiling or calibration tool for adjusting the display brightness of images in a window (Column 19, Line 48 — Column 20, Line 24). Although a "display brightness" is recited in claim 1, a "screen brightness" is also recited. What is meant by a screen brightness, for example, is a brightness of a backlight of a display unit such as a LCD (page 12, lines 8-12). Evanicky does not teach or suggest a screen brightness as recited in claim 1.

In fact, as above mentioned, Evanicky discloses a calibration tool for adjusting a display brightness. However, Evanicky does not teach or suggest the cooperation of changing a screen brightness according to a detected display brightness to improve a visibility of a display unit to an user viewing the display unit. As such, Evanicky does not teach or suggest this cooperation in conjunction with the other elements of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Applicant submits that claim 2 is also allowable since it depends directly upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 3

Applicant respectfully traverses with the Examiner's rejection of claim 3. For ease of review, claim 3 is reproduced below:

3. A liquid crystal display unit, comprising:
a liquid crystal display screen for displaying a first image;
a back-light for lighting the liquid crystal display screen; and
a brightness controller for controlling a brightness of the back-light;
wherein the brightness controller executes the following processings:
receiving a brightness control signal generated according to a display brightness in a specific area calculated from a draw signal in a second image in the specific area, the second image being selected from a plurality of images to be displayed in the liquid crystal display screen; and
changing the brightness of the back-light according to the brightness control signal to change the display brightness and to improve a visibility of the display unit to an user viewing the display unit.

As above mentioned, Evanicky discloses a graphic user interface which provides a color profiling or calibration tool for adjusting the display brightness of images in a window. However, Evanicky does not teach or suggest a back-light for lighting a liquid crystal display screen as recited in claim 3.

Furthermore, Evanicky does not teach or suggest the cooperation of a brightness control signal, which is generated according to a display brightness in a specific area, and a back-light of a liquid crystal display screen. Evanicky also does not teach or suggest that the back-light of the liquid crystal display screen is changed according to the display brightness in a specific area and that the cooperation of the brightness control signal and the back-light is utilized to improve a visibility of the display unit to an user viewing the display unit. Additionally, Evanicky does not teach other limitations recited in claim 3.

Accordingly, Evanicky does not teach or suggest this cooperation in conjunction with the other elements recited in claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable over the cited reference.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-3 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

December 7, 2007

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 54161
(650) 493-4540
(650) 493-4549